

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1–30. The Examiner has objected to claim 10. Claims 1, 5, 10, 21, 24, 25, 29, and 30 have been amended to further recite the features of the invention. As a result, claims 1–30 are pending for examination with claims 1, 6, 15, 21, and 25 being independent claims. The amendments made find support in the specification and do not constitute new matter.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 10 because of the noted informality at line 22, where “herein”, should read “wherein”. Applicants have corrected the noted informalities.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1–30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Canon Kabushiki Kaisha (European Patent Application EP1205843A) (“Canon”). The Examiner asserts that Canon teaches “a process[or]–controlled machine” that can be Applicants’ claimed “print server computer for servicing print requests from one or more client computers.” (OA, pg. 4, lines 14–15) Applicants traverse the Examiner’s rejection and point out that Canon specifically states that “the processor–controlled machine is the printer” (Canon, para 28, line 2) and not a “print server computer”. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended the claims to further recite the invention.

Amendment

Application Number: 10/804,619

Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

Applicants have amended claim 1 to call for:

“a server...wherein the server is a print server...” (underlining added for emphasis)

Claim 6 calls for:

“a print server...” (underlining added for emphasis)

Claim 15 call for:

“providing a print spooler interface for an application to communicate with a client which in turn communicates with a print server...” (underlining added for emphasis)

Applicants have amended claims 21 and 25 to call for:

“providing an interface for an application to communicate with a client computer which in turn communicates with a server... wherein the server is a print server...” (underlining added for emphasis)

Amendment

Application Number: 10/804,619

Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

As such, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 6, 15, 21, and 25 are not anticipated by Conon under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

The present invention provides:

“An exemplary system is for use in printing data on a printer. A client interfaces with an applications program that has a print capability. A print server in communication with the client controls a printing of data communicated to the print server by the client. A user interface manager communicates with the print server by an asynchronous communications channel between the print server and the client. The user interface manager responds to a user interface message sent from the print server to display information to a user in a flexible custom manner.”

(underlining added for emphasis)

Note that the present invention teaches a very particular type of server: a print server—as well known by those skilled in the art at the time of the invention, a system or device to which one or more printers are connected and that can accept print jobs from external client computers connected to the print server via some means of communication such as a network.

Amendment

Application Number: 10/804,619

Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

Canon, on the other hand provides:

“Figure 6a shows a display screen 40 representing a user interface that may be displayed on the display 32 of the user interface device 12 where, as shown in Figure 5, the processor-controlled machine is the printer 5.” (Canon, para 28, lines 1–2; underlining added for emphasis)

Canon further provides:

“Processor-controlled machines such as items of office equipment, for example printers, scanners and photocopiers, are generally each provided with their own machine-specific user interface. These user interfaces differ markedly not only between machines carrying out different functions (that is between printers, scanners, photocopiers, fax machines and so on) but also between different machines capable of carrying out the same function. Thus, for example, photocopiers supplied by different manufacturers will generally have different user interfaces.”
(Canon, para 28, lines 1–2; underlining added for emphasis)

Thus Canon specifically defines the term “processor-controlled machine” as a “printer.” Canon more generally refers to “processor-controlled machines” as “office equipment” such as “printers, scanners, photocopiers, fax machines and so on”. As such, it is clear that Canon’s processor-controlled machine is different than the Applicants’ print server.

Amendment
Application Number: 10/804,619
Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

AMENDMENT

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 6, 15, 21, and 25 are not anticipated by Canon under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claims 2-5, 7-14, 16-20, 22-25, and 26-30 are dependent on at least one of claims 1, 6, 15, 21, and 25. As such, claims 2-5, 7-14, 16-20, 22-25, and 26-30 are believed allowable, at least in part, based upon claims 1, 6, 15, 21, and 25.

Applicants have amended claims 5, 24, 29, and 30 to address issues of antecedent basis; the scope of claims 5, 24, 29, and 30 remains unchanged.

Accordingly, reconsideration and examination of the above-referenced application is requested.

Amendment

Application Number: 10/804,619

Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: July 27, 2007

By: /L. Alan Collins/

L. Alan Collins, Reg. No.: 57,646
Direct telephone (425) 703-8265
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

Amendment

Application Number: 10/804,619

Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01